

[Mrs. SCHROEDER addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MILLER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. KLINK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. SLAUGHTER addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. JACKSON-LEE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILLIARD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HILLIARD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Puerto Rico [Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MANTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. CARDIN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. ORTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. FIELDS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All Members having been called, no one is seeking additional time under the 5-minute rule.

CAUSES OF POVERTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] is recognized for 35 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be joined tonight by several other Members who will be speaking in a moment.

Mr. Speaker, most of the discussion today dealt with the need for welfare reform, of which there is not a whole lot of disagreement, but I was rather shocked at how superficial in many ways the discussion about welfare reform today has been.

Illegitimate children and the problem of drug addiction and the very serious crime problem that we face as a Nation are not the causes of poverty and are not the causes of the need for welfare. Rather, to a large degree, it is the reverse, the opposite that is true.

In many respects, our country is becoming a poorer and poorer Nation. And not to talk about the causes of poverty, the loss of millions of good-paying manufacturing jobs, the decline in the wages that our working people are receiving, the growth of low-wage jobs, not to talk about that reality when we talk about welfare is absolutely absurd.

Mr. Speaker, between 1979 and 1992, the number of full-time workers earning wages under the poverty line increased from 12 to 18 percent. Eighteen percent of our workers now are earning poverty wages. Between 1990 and 1992, half of the women in the United States who found full-time jobs were earning the poverty wage.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Sanders, would you be willing to engage in a debate on precisely this point?

Mr. SANDERS. I will tell you what. We have only 35 minutes, and we have got four of us here. I would really love to do that. And if we do agree to do it sometime later this week or next week, I really would love to do that.

But we have got four people. We do not have Rush Limbaugh and G. Gordon Liddy.

Mr. HOKE. You have got the Washington Post.

Mr. SANDERS. I think not. I think not. But I thank you. I would love to do it. I really would.

Mr. HOKE. Thank you.

Mr. SANDERS. In terms of welfare, not to understand that the \$4.25 minimum wage today is virtually a starvation wage which forces people into welfare is not to understand the reality of what is going on in America today. The minimum wage today is 20 percent lower in purchasing power than it was in 1970.

If we are serious, it seems to me, about welfare reform, then we must begin to talk about a real jobs program which rebuilds America. There is an enormous amount of work that could be done. We could take people off of welfare and put them to work rebuilding America, but we are not hearing that discussion from our Republican friends.

If we are serious about welfare reform, we must talk about raising the minimum wage to a living wage so people can escape from poverty and earn enough money to take care of their children.

If we are serious about welfare reform, we must improve our child care capabilities. What mother, what father can go out to work and leave his or her children abandoned in a house or an inadequate child care capabilities? That would be wrong.

If we are serious about welfare reform, we must educate our people and provide job training so they can, in fact, go out and earn the wages that they need and the dignity that they want.

The last point I want to make before I give the floor over to my good friend from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is to say that when we talk about welfare reform, which is a very important subject, we should also understand that welfare reform for the poor is only one part of the issue. We should also be talking about welfare reform for the rich and welfare reform for the large multinational corporations.

Studies done by conservative groups such as the CATO Institute, liberal groups like Ralph Nader's Public Citizen, moderate groups like the Democratic Leadership Council's Progressive Policy Institute have demonstrated that there are tens and tens and tens of billions of dollars in welfare that go to the rich and go to the big corporations. So if we are serious about welfare reform, I think it is appropriate we begin that debate as well.

I am now happy to introduce my good friend from Ohio, MARCY KAPTUR.

Ms. KAPTUR. I want to thank Congressman SANDERS for your refreshing point of view and as the only independent Member of the House of Representatives for the extra effort that you put into trying to look behind the curtain and see what is really going on in important programs like the welfare program which is so much in need of reform.

What I liked about the Deal bill that was before us today was it absolutely linked work with welfare reform, and it provided mechanisms to move people into at least reading the want ads, having job conferences, trying to get the skills right away, the minute that the bill went into effect under the Republican version that I guess we will vote on on Friday. You don't even have to read the want ads for two years.

So I like the tight linkage in the measure that we considered earlier today.

But you mentioned women in the work force. And, of course, there are a lot of women and children on welfare in our country today.

And there was a new Brookings Institution study of women who were in their 20's who had received welfare at some point during the late 1970's and 1980's, and what was very interesting about that study was that it showed they did leave welfare. Two-thirds of the people do. But the women earned a median wage of about \$5.20 an hour. That is too little to pull a family of three above the poverty line even with full-time work.

And low wages are the reason that two-thirds of those who leave welfare return within 3 years for some period of time, usually to get their footing again, and then they go back out there. I meet these women in my own district, working in bakeries, working in laundromats, working in restaurants.

By the way, nonunion restaurants, where they are not guaranteed of health benefits. But a lot of them fall back on to welfare. They don't want to be there.

I am sure there are loafers on every program, and we have problems with family structure in this country, but let us recognize that for many people and half of the people in my district on welfare work.

What a terrible, terrible indictment of this society that people who go out there, 40, 50, 60 hours a week, are on welfare. The system isn't working for them. In fact, the numbers show that a person who works 40 hours a week, 50 weeks per year at the current \$4.25 minimum earns only \$8,500 a year, not really enough to support a family.

If the gentleman would just indulge me one extra minute here.

I was thinking as I was driving through my city the other day about my mother's life. And she doesn't get C-SPAN. She doesn't get cable. So she can't hear me tonight. But how her life really differed from those of the women who are growing up in the neighborhoods that she lived in that she grew up as a child.

And the big difference is that the jobs that were there that she could walk to, because no family was more poor than my mother's family poor, Champion Sparkplug is no longer in Toledo. Chase Bank, that was right up the street where my aunt worked, closed its door, moved offshore. The glove factory that my cousin worked at

isn't there anymore. Dana Corporation moved 3,500 jobs to Mexico and out of our city. Bostwick Brown. Durwick Corporation. Swift and Armour. All the bicycle manufacturing capacity of the country was moved to Taiwan. When you think about what has happened to people, it isn't easy for them to find good-paying jobs.

Mr. SANDERS. If I could just jump in and say not to understand that reality and when we discuss welfare reform is totally absurd.

If I might, we have been joined by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS]. An interesting night because we have somebody from the Midwest, somebody from the south, Mr. BECERRA is from California, and I am from Vermont, so I think it should be a good discussion.

□ 2300

Mr. FIELDS, would you like to join us. Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman from Vermont for yielding. I just wanted to echo some of the sentiments of my colleagues about the need to create jobs and the need to improve the minimum wage. We have people wake up every morning, as each of you know, and they go to work every day, and at the end of the day they are still poor. It is not because they are lazy, but simply because we need to raise the minimum wage.

We have Members of this Congress who have the gall to walk into this august body making \$560 a day and telling people making \$680 a month that they do not deserve a minimum wage increase, and then we say we need to get people off of welfare and we need to put people on payrolls. And if we really want to put people on payrolls, I mean, does the gentleman realize last week we took 600,000 or 1.2 million young people off the payrolls? So if you really want to put people on payrolls, you do not do it by cutting summer jobs. So I think all this is all somewhat inconsistent.

But if I may, if the gentleman would yield a few more seconds, I would like to make note of a scroll I received from my district, to change the subject a little bit, because students at Queensborough Elementary School received a lot of criticism, the teachers as well, by Rush Limbaugh, because these students decided to write a scroll and send this scroll to Washington, DC, concerned about their school lunch program. I just take strong issue with anybody criticizing students for writing their Member of Congress.

Mr. SANDERS. Rush Limbaugh is that low income fellow that has a hard time feeding himself, is that the fellow?

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. I do not think he has missed a meal.

Mr. SANDERS. That makes \$25 million a year, I believe, the same fellow.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. If not more. The problem I have with that, the kids have a right to be concerned about their school nutrition program, because the fact of the matter is if you

look at the Republican proposal, there is no nutritional standards in the school nutrition program. Not only that, 20 percent of their money can be used for other purposes.

So I want to thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to thank these kids and all these teachers for writing these very, very distinguished scrolls.

Mr. SANDERS. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA].

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman from Vermont for not only yielding, but also for scheduling this special order and giving us all an opportunity to discuss further some of the aspects of this whole debate we are going through on the contract on America. I am glad I can join my colleagues. Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. FIELDS on this particular debate, because it is very interesting.

We are now at a point where we are discussing so-called welfare reform, and what we find in the bill before us, H.R. 4 on the floor, it is the version, sort of a pseudo-version of what was in the contract on America.

What we find is that the Republicans claim that they are going to save about \$66 billion through this welfare reform package, yet they are not going to cut school lunches, day-care. Somehow they are going to save without making cuts they say, but we know in fact they will cut.

But perhaps the most egregious aspect of these cuts is not just that they go after kids, not just that some of these cuts they are making overall go after elderly, not that they go after the disabled, but the use of these cuts. We had yesterday debated on the floor of this House a particular amendment that was supposed to be technical. It was a change that was made, and I know the cameras can't pick this up for our colleagues to see, but what I want to read what that amendment said. This is what we had to spot. It said page 393, strike line 4 and all that follows through line 7. Page 393, strike line 5, strike "technical amendment."

What that line did was it changed what the bill said which required that monies that would be cut and therefore would be available for deficit reduction would no longer be earmarked for deficit reduction, but instead could be used for things like financing tax cuts. Which tax cuts? Well, we know the capital gains tax cut is being proposed under the Republican's contract on America, and they need about \$200 billion to pay for these tax cuts.

So all of a sudden we are finding that welfare reform, which is being used by the Republicans to save monies by cutting children's programs, school lunch, by cutting the disabled programs, by cutting programs for the elderly, are going to be used no longer for deficit reduction, as much as you may not have liked all the cuts, but now they are available to be used for tax cuts. As the gentleman from Vermont has indicated, most of these tax cuts will

go to the wealthiest Americans earning more than \$200,000.

Mr. SANDERS. Next week I believe the tax bill will be coming before the House. Last week the House Committee on Ways and Means, as I understand it, passed a provision, this is hard to believe, especially for people, those real deficit hawks concerned about the large deficit, that would repeal the minimal corporate tax.

Now, some people may remember that in the early 1980's, when the large corporations in America were writing tax law in this country, what we had is the outrage, was the outrage of huge multibillion dollar corporations like General Electric, AT&T, du Pont, wealthy, powerful corporations, who were paying in the early 1980's zero in taxes. Zero in taxes.

Well, the embarrassment became so deep that finally in 1986, a minimal corporate tax was passed that said, corporations, even with all your good lawyers you can go through all the loopholes you have put into the system and you pay nothing in taxes, there has got to be a minimal tax.

Recently, last week, the House Committee on Ways and Means proposed to do away with that minimal tax. But I know that there is another aspect of corporate welfare that has interested Ms. KAPTUR very, very much, and that is the bailout of Mexico. And maybe in terms of the discussion that we are having now, in which last week we cut back, the Republicans voted to cut back on fuel assistance for 5 million Americans, cut back on the WIC program, cut back on senior citizen housing, now, tell us perhaps how could we find \$20 billion, not just the Republican problem by the way, how can we find \$20 billion to bail out Mexico?

Ms. KAPTUR. I am glad you asked that question Congressman SANDERS, because it is just another one of those Washington miracles that happens without a vote of Congress. As hard as we tried to get the Speaker of this House to bring a bill on the floor to allow us to stop disbursements of additional dollars to Mexico, he would not bring up that bill, because he was a partner to the decisions that were made by the Clinton administration.

Mr. SANDERS. Let us be fair. This was bipartisan leadership.

Ms. KAPTUR. Yes, about six Caucasian men made this decision for 250 million people. And we effectively, the other 432 Members of this body, had nothing to say about it, and it is amazing to me how few people are even raising their voices. And yet \$5 billion is out the door, another \$15 billion is ready to go, and who knows how much more, because three banks in Mexico collapsed a week and a half ago.

They are having difficulty refinancing their tesobono offerings, and yet our Government could find \$20 billion basically to give to Mexico so she could pay her Wall Street creditors, the speculators who are earning 66 percent interest on bonds that they had bought.

They should have eaten their losses, as they ate their earnings over the last 5 years. But they have a special call at the Treasury of the people of the United States, and yet the people from my district, 25,000 of them who got their heating assistance cut, they had no special call in Washington. No Washington miracle happened for them. For those millions of kids that will not get a summer job, there was no Washington miracle for them.

Mr. SANDERS. If I might interrupt, Mr. FIELDS from Louisiana, what does it look like when kids are going to see cutbacks in nutrition programs and \$20 billion is spent bailing out Mexico?

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. It is quite hard to go home and explain to kids in Louisiana that will not have a summer job this summer if this proposal passes the Senate and is signed by the President of the United States of America. It is difficult to stand up in a town hall meeting and tell the parent of a kid who will not have a summer job that we just sent \$20 billion to Mexico.

Then to add insult to injury, while we cut domestic aid, we spend \$14 billion overseas. It is all right if you live outside of America and you want a summer job, because we are going to spend \$14 billion to do it. It is all right if you live outside of America and you want a balanced meal, because we are going to spend \$2.2 billion to do that.

The last point I want to make to the gentleman is we spent a lot of time on the balanced budget amendment. We should be spending some time on a balanced meal amendment, because under this proposal that will pass this House tomorrow, there is no standard, no national standard whatsoever. Yes, you got groups looking at it, talking about what should be done in the future, but there is no national standard. I think that is an insult to the children of our country.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. BECERRA, what does it look like to the people in California?

Mr. BECERRA. Let me tell you, I have a chart here that I would like to go through a bit with all of my colleagues here, because I think it makes a very interesting point. We find that in the contract with America, we have those who gain, and those who lose. And although I think the writing may be a little bit difficult to read from a distance, what we are talking about is in terms of those who gain, \$200 billion, well, if you happen to earn more than \$75,000 a year, \$94 billion of the 200 billion you can expect to go to you. That group of people. Of course, if you earn over \$200,000 a year, you find you get the lion's share of that money. Those between \$50,000 and 75,000 in income get \$1 billion. You start to go to those of \$40- to 50,000 income, 24 billion. Income of 30- to 40,000 dollars, you get 22 billion of the 200 billion.

□ 2310

Incomes of 20,000 to 30,000, you are going to get about 13 billion out of an entire 200 billion pot. If you earn less

than 20,000, you will get about 5 billion. So when you look at the average American family, incomes probably below 50,000, you see that you get less than a third of all the benefits of these tax cuts that are being proposed in the Contract on America.

That is not bad enough. Let us take a look at who pays: 24 billion is paid for by poor families with children, mostly through the cuts that we are hearing about in the welfare bill that we have, H.R. 4; 2 billion is being taken from abused and neglected children programs; 19 billion is being taken from food stamp recipients, 12 billion is being taken from kinds who lose school lunches, child care and WIC; 21 billion taken from legal aliens.

I want to mention something here. These are individuals who have every right to be in this country. Ultimately will become U.S. citizens once they achieve 5 years in this country. They are law abiding. They pay every single tax that a citizen must pay. They even serve in our armed services defending this country in time of war.

So they are law abiding. They provide every single kind of tax that is a citizen does, yet they are bearing the brunt of the cost in the so-called reform of welfare under the Republican welfare reform bill. We are taking \$10 billion from Medicare. We are taking 12 billion from Civil Service pensions, people who have worked, a lot of them, in our military. And we are taking \$100 billion in spending cuts yet to be identified. That means, in other words, that those who sponsor the Contract on America have not yet told us where they are getting 100 billion. So clearly those who gain, if you earn over \$100,000, you gain. Those who lose, well, usually if you are middle income or low income, you will pay for those tax cuts that are going to go to top, that earn over \$100,000 or \$200,000.

Mr. SANDERS. If I could just ask the gentleman a question, within the last couple of months there were two very well publicized fundraising events here in the Nation's Capital. On one night, I believe it was about a month ago, the Republican party raised in one night \$11 million. On another occasion, Senator GRAMM, who is a Republican candidate for their nomination for president, raised, I believe, over \$3 million on one night. On another occasion, Speaker GINGRICH held a fundraiser for his television network at \$50,000 a plate.

Now, I find it interesting that the Contract With America, must have been just an oversight, I am sure, just by accident, they forgot to put in campaign finance reform. Clearly an oversight, clearly has nothing to do with what you have just been talking about.

In other words, we all understand that this system is dominated by money and big money. When people contribute \$11 million in one night, when the wealthiest people in America make those contributions, they are not

doing it because they are nice guys. It is an investment. And the investment that they are making is precisely what Mr. BECERRA was talking about a moment ago. Tax breaks for the rich.

Mr. BECERRA. I think we should point out one particular aspect of that third fundraising event that you mentioned. That is the event where Speaker NEWT GINGRICH helped raise money for his television network that has a political slant to it. That \$50,000 a plate dinner was tax deductible. So about a third of the cost of that \$50,000 that is contributed for what will ultimately be fairly political activities, is being written off by those wealthy individuals. And who pays? Obviously, the rest of us middle- and low-income taxpayers, because somebody has to make up the cost of that subsidy that we are paying the wealthy individuals to take.

Mr. SANDERS. At the same time as we are talking about defunding public radio and public television.

Ms. KAPTUR, the relationship of campaign finance reform to our discussion.

Ms. KAPTUR. Maybe we could work out a deal for our senior citizens who just got cut off their heating assistance. Maybe we could give them an equal tax cut where they could get a credit just like those companies got that contributed \$50,000, did you say, a plate? But we will turn it into a new form of tax credit and refund their winter heating assistance to them in the same way.

I wonder if Speaker GINGRICH would help us amend the tax code in order to help all those seniors across this country who come from northern climates that are going to have a very difficult time paying their bills? It seems to me what is fair is fair. And I do not support that form of back door campaign financing, but I would think we might use the same measure for people who are truly in need.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. FIELDS, do many of your constituents spend \$50,000 for a dinner.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Very few. As a matter of fact, I do not know any right off the bat, any of my constituents who would spend that kind of money. It goes to show you this whole debate is not about helping poor people and making them self-sufficient. It is about taking as much as possible away from the poor and giving it to the rich.

It is no surprise that 68 percent of these cuts are coming, laying on the backs of poor people and children. And there is certainly no surprise, the fact that we got people who live on trust funds who try to tell people on welfare how to live. When they talk about how they want to make people self-sufficient and then they penalize babies and they say, we are not penalizing babies.

This is not a surprise to me, and I am sure it is no surprise to you that an infant cannot wake up in the morning and buy milk. An infant just cannot do that. When you take milk away from an infant, you are penalizing the baby.

You are not penalizing the mother as much as you are penalizing that infant.

Mr. BECERRA. There is something really strange and perverse about a society when we can have people fly from across the country, if they are wealthy enough to come lobby Members of Congress, go out and have lunch. Deduct it because it is a business expense of coming down here, deduct that \$50 dollar lunch that they may have, deduct it and come over here and tell us that we should be cutting school lunch programs for kids while they are writing off as a tax deduction a business tax deduction, the cost of a lunch they may have at a very expensive restaurant. What we are doing is, a lot of us are standing up and saying, what is going on here.

We want to reform welfare. We just voted on a Democratic alternative by some Members, more conservative Members of the Democratic Caucus, that would have reformed welfare but what it would have said is, let us make you work. If you are on welfare, it is a transition to get you to work. And let us understand that we have to be realistic. If you have got a daughter or a son and you need to go to work, well, you are going to probably need some day care. So we are going to help you so you can keep that job by providing you with some day care, making sure you do not lose your medical benefits because, obviously, as soon as you lose those medical benefits and you have some problems with the child getting sick, you are going to drop your job and you are going to get back on welfare.

So let us be realistic. Let us reform, but let us make sure in the process of reforming what we are saying is, get to work.

Mr. SANDERS. If I might, I find really one of the more outrageous outrages of the Contract With America is when we talk, every single day on the floor of this House, people talk about the virtues of education. We hear it all of the time. And yet built within the Contract With America are major cutbacks which will make it increasingly difficult for millions of young Americans to afford to go to college.

I am sure the situation is the same in Ohio, Louisiana or California. Certainly it is in Vermont. I am getting letters every day where people say, Congressman SANDERS, do not let them cut back on the Pell grants. That is what keeps me in college. Do not have them force me to pay interest while I am in college on my loans. It means I am going to drop out of college. Do not let them cut back the work study program.

When everybody understands that it is extremely difficult today to earn a good living without a college degree, the shortsightedness and the selfishness of saying to working-class Americans, sorry, we are giving tax breaks to the rich or maybe we are going to put \$50 billion in star wars, but for young Americans, I got a letter today, Con-

gressman SANDERS, I am working two jobs, taking a full-time load in my college in Vermont. Do not let them cut back. Yet some people think star wars, tax breaks for the rich, are a greater priority.

I do not understand that at all.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. National Service is a prime example, National Service. The Republican party decided to take money away from National Service, a program that gives young people an opportunity to earn their way through college, not welfare. But a workfare program, a program where young people go to work every morning and work with civic service organizations and then pay their way through college. Cut it out.

Is that real welfare reform? And is that real, is that what we do for our young people in America? I think not. I think that is one of the problems in this country. It is all about what we do for those who have the most.

Mr. SANDERS. Ms. KAPTUR.

Ms. KAPTUR. I wanted to add a comment there on student loans. In the State of Ohio, we literally, in the last month and a half, have had students arrested. I have not seen this in a couple generations. Arrested in our capital city of Columbus, concerned about the fact that what you said, Congressman SANDERS, that the cost of their loans would be going up even more than they have already gone up, that they would have to be paying interest on their borrowings immediately. And we know that even now most of the students that graduate, graduate in huge debt. And when they graduate, what kind of a job can they go to?

□ 2320

A lot of them are going into jobs that are \$14,000-a-year jobs, and they are shocked even with a college degree at how little they earn. I know I have talked to people from Congressman FIELD's State, women who work on those shrimp, in those shrimp operations where they are doing I do not know how many hundreds of those things an hour, they all get carpal tunnel syndrome by the time they are in their mid 30s, and they are making about 3 bucks an hour. Now, those are working people and yet they do not earn a living wage, so whether you are a college graduate in this country, loaded up with debt and the contract says we are going to load you up with more debt and more interest or whether you are working in a shrimping operation in Louisiana or in a dry cleaners shop in Toledo, HO, you can't earn a living wage even if you work 40 hours a week.

Mr. SANDERS. I would just simply say, and I say this, by the way, as an independent, and in my view it is wrong just to blame the Republicans and not to hold Democrats in criticism as well, but I think one thing that has disturbed me very much as we discuss the problems facing this country is

that in this recent election in November when the Republicans took power in both houses, all of 38 percent of the American people came out to vote. Sixty-two percent of the people are so turned off by the political system they did not bother to vote. Most poor people in America, many working people in America do not vote. So what ends up happening is you have 38 percent of the people who vote, you have people who contribute huge amounts of money to the political system, they are able to finance candidates of their choice, so you have one whole group is invisible. If you do not vote and you are earning the minimum wage, who do you think is going to care about you? If somebody contributes, they buy a table for \$10,000 at the Republican fundraiser, that 10 people will have far more influence over the political process than 20,000 people in Louisiana who are working for minimum wage or farmers in Vermont who are trying to get by on \$10,000 a year.

So I would simply hope that we can revitalize the political process. If we increase voter turnout by 20 percent, this institution would be radically different. Mr. BECERRA.

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding again.

I think the gentleman from Vermont is hitting on a very important point. I think a lot of us take our time at 11:30 at night to be here to discuss this because obviously we are not just trying to talk to our colleagues but we are also trying to communicate to the American people. We have to make sure we let folks understand what is going on. This Contract that was a political contract lobbied and campaigned upon back in November, what did it mean, and what is happening with that because really when you take a look at what is being done, there really is an inconsistency with trying to be American and promote America, and what is being done in contracts that say things and when you read those find details of the contract, you find something different. The gentleman from Vermont raised an interesting point. We are talking right now over the last week or so about cuts to children's programs, school lunches, other nutrition programs, child care for kids. You have to say what is next. Then all of a sudden you find on the horizon that the next thing is not just on kids, but now it is on our young people that are getting ready to go to college with student loans and student grants where we are going to cut a lot of the moneys that we provide for our young people to afford a college education.

I have got to say one thing here. I have a 22-month-old daughter. I sat down with a financial planner, my wife and I about 3 months ago, 4 months ago, and we asked that financial planner what will it cost us to get our child through college when she grows up. We were told, well, it depends. Public school, you can probably count on

something approaching \$150,000. Private school, and I was very fortunate to go to Stanford University, they said Stanford University, you can expect to spend about \$400,000 for your child to get educated. What is next? Student loans. My goodness.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS], and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] very much.

WELFARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LEWIS], is recognized for 35 minutes as a designee of the majority leader.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield my time right now to my good friend from Ohio to start us off this evening.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank my good friend from Kentucky [Mr. LEWIS], for yielding this time. What we are going to be doing is discussing the welfare system in this country and why Republicans and some Democrats as well believe that the welfare has been so destructive in this country that we feel very strongly that we need to change the welfare system dramatically.

We have heard a lot of Democrats this week, and in fact since I have been a Member of Congress, be cute when they refer to the Contract With America, and they keep saying it is a Contract On America, which is ludicrous.

It is a Contract With America. This is a document that we all signed. After talking with people all across this country, and they said these are the things that we want. If we elect a majority of Republicans, these are the things we would like you to change when you get there.

Well, the people in my district saw fit to send me here, and one of the main things they wanted to change was the welfare system. They realized, I heard over and over again, that the welfare system is wrong. We spend far too much money on welfare, and most of that money is counterproductive. We are hurting more people than we are helping on welfare.

I was a school teacher in Cincinnati for a number of years in an inner city school. I worked for the recreation department in an inner city area, and I saw kids over and over and over again who came from homes where there was no father in the home.

The vast majority of these families did not have a father in the home. They had the government, in effect, as their father. The Federal Government sent a welfare check every month. No father in the home, no father figure. They expected the government to pay for them from basically from cradle to grave, and that is what we have to change.

We have got kids in homes all across this country who never see an adult in

the home go to work. We have to change that. The welfare system is broken.

What I think we are hearing on the other side of the aisle, what we have been hearing the past couple of days from particularly the liberal Democrats on the other side of the aisle is the last gasps of a dying philosophy, a philosophy that says the government is the way to go, the government owes everybody a living, people do not have to work, people do not have to be responsible for their own lives, American families are to support other people's kids.

Not only do they have to support their own kids, but the Federal Government takes a large portion of their money, sends it up here to Washington, it gets eaten up in this bureaucracy, this welfare bureaucracy.

Some of it gets sent back to the States, and much of that money is wasted, and it is counterproductive. We have to change that, and that is what we are here to talk about this evening.

I am very pleased that I am joined here by my good friend from Ohio [MARTIN HOKE], and a very good friend from Arizona [J.D. HAYWORTH], who are also going to contribute and talk in this colloquy.

Mr. HOKE. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. CHABOT. Absolutely.

Mr. HOKE. Does this sound familiar? Who said, "I will eliminate welfare as we know it today"? Does that sound familiar?

Mr. CHABOT. I believe it was our President who said that in the campaign a couple of years ago.

Mr. HOKE. A couple years ago, 1992, all summer 1992. Was this a sucker punch?

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. HOKE. Is that what was going on? Now, in the 103d Congress I do not recall any welfare reform bill whatsoever ever coming to the floor of this Congress.

Mr. CHABOT. That is exactly right. Of course, that is the same President who told us he was going to give us a middle-class tax cut and then did just the opposite and raised taxes on the American people. That is one reason that the American people said enough and changed Congress and sent folks like us here to change Congress.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If my friends from Ohio would yield, and I recognize my friend from Kentucky controls the time, and as I have been checking in other quarters, a certain school from Kentucky controls the basketball game tonight.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Good

Mr. HAYWORTH. Between the University of Kentucky and Arizona State. Much to his delight, much to my chagrin. But it really brings forth a description of both that basketball tournament and I believe it is safe to say what has transpired here in the halls of the Congress, and that is March madness that is really without parallel. I